

Applicant: Hunkeler et al.
Application No.: 10/679,804

REMARKS

Claims 22-25, 29-42, and 43-55 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-21, 26-28, and 33-42 are previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 43-55 are newly added.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,149,524 to Reynolds (hereinafter “Reynolds”), U.S. Patent No. 7,580,390 to O’Shea (hereinafter “O’Shea”), and PCT Patent Application No. WO01/65881 to Kauhanen (hereinafter “Kauhanen”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for at least the reason that these references do not teach or suggest translating, in the WTRU, the first QoS requirement parameter to a second QoS requirement parameter that is defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type, . . . wherein the first QoS requirement parameter and the second QoS requirement parameter are different as recited in claim 22.

The current Office Action acknowledges that Reynolds does not teach the above-highlighted features of claim 22, and relies primarily upon the assertion that these features are suggested by O’Shea. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

O’Shea describes a method for reducing frequency errors during transitions between different wireless communication systems, such as GSM and WCDMA. According to O’Shea’s method, when a wireless communication device (WCD) is in a WCDMA system, it obtains a value for a frequency offset parameter, using a technique such as frequency offset estimation. *O’Shea, column 6 line 63 – column 7 line 8.* The WCD then performs a handover to the GSM system; when doing so, it adjusts the value of the frequency offset parameter (from the WCDMA system), for use as a frequency offset parameter value in the GSM system. *O’Shea, column 7, lines 25-50.* This is made especially clear in claim 1 of O’Shea, which recites (emphasis added) “using the frequency ratio to *convert the frequency offset for the first wireless signal to a frequency offset for the second wireless signal.*”

The current Office Action asserts that O’Shea’s frequency offset parameter is analogous to the claimed first QoS requirement parameter and second QoS requirement parameter. However, in claim 22, the first QoS requirement parameter and the second QoS requirement parameter are different, whereas, in O’Shea, the parameter (frequency offset) is the same in both the GSM and WCDMA systems. Thus, O’Shea is not suggestive of these features of claim 22.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Kauhanen also does not teach or suggest these features of claim 22. Kauhanen teaches handover of a mobile station

Applicant: Hunkeler et al.
Application No.: 10/679,804

from the Mobile Switching Center (MSC) of a packet switched UMTS network to the MSC of a circuit switched GSM network. The mobile station uses a set of “default parameters” to establish bearers in the target GSM network, and Kauhanen describes that the default parameters are obtained based on “mapping from the UMTS side bearer quality of service (QoS).” *Kauhanen, page 12, lines 17-18.* Kauhanen describes that this “mapping” is performed only by controller elements in the network, such as the MSCs. Nowhere, however, does Kauhanen teach that the “mapping” is performed by the mobile station. Thus, Kauhanen does not teach or suggest (emphasis added) translating, in the WTRU, the first QoS requirement parameter to a second QoS requirement parameter that is defined according to a second wireless communication system of a second type as recited in claim 22.

For the above reasons, Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claim 22 highlighted above. For at least this reason, claim 22 is non-obvious over this combination.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 22 is respectfully requested.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of Claims 23-25, 29-35, and 36-42

Claims 23-25, 29-34 and 36-41 also stand rejected as obvious over Reynolds, O’Shea, and Kauhanen. Independent claim 29, though not identical to claim 22,

Applicant: Hunkeler et al.
Application No.: 10/679,804

recites similar features as claim 22, and is non-obvious over these references for similar reasons as those presented above regarding claim 22. Claims 23-25 and 30-32 are non-obvious over these references at least by virtue of their respective dependencies upon claims 22 and 29. Claims 33-34 and 36-41 are canceled and so their rejection is moot.

Claims 35 and 42 stand rejected as obvious over the combination of Reynolds, O'Shea, and Kauhanen, and U.S. Patent No. 7,092,374 to Gubbi (hereinafter "Gubbi"). Gubbi does not cure the defects of Reynolds, O'Shea, and Kauhanen, and so claim 22 is non-obvious over this combination. Claim 35 is non-obvious over this combination at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 22. Claim 42 is canceled and so its rejection is moot.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103 rejection of claims 23-25, 29-35, and 36-42 is respectfully requested.

New Claims 43-54

New claim 49, though not identical to claim 22, recites similar features as claim 22, and is non-obvious over Reynolds, O'Shea, and Kauhanen, and Gubbi for similar reasons as those set forth above regarding claim 22. Claims 43-48 and 50-54 are non-obvious over these references at least by virtue of their respective dependencies upon claims 22, 29, and 49.

Applicant: Hunkeler et al.
Application No.: 10/679,804

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunkeler et al.

By /Joseph E. McNamara/
Joseph E. McNamara
Registration No. 60,521

Volpe and Koenig, P.C
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

JEM/jmn
Enclosures